

To Whom It May Concern...

I've read of Sinclair Broadcasting's action, pre-empting regular programming on its affiliated stations to air an anti John Kerry documentary.

If this were balanced with an opposing view, (a broadcast of the film, "Going Upriver", in a similar time slot the next evening, for example), that would be one thing..., however, that is not the case.

The timing, so close to the November 2nd Presidential election, is not a coincidence. It is against the law for a corporation to try and directly influence such an election, is it not?

Aren't they required by law to serve the public interest? I believe this springs from the fact that entities like Sinclair use the publicly owned airwaves free of charge, thereby obligating them to serve we, the people.

I already have misgivings re: media consolidation, and the undue influence wielded by fewer, but more powerful entities. This action by Sinclair only reinforces those misgivings.

Sinclair's actions demonstrate the need for laws that make it MORE difficult for a single entity to own vast shares of the public broadcast network. We need stronger media ownership rules, not weaker ones.

Thank you.

Geoffrey Goodell